HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 30 | Monday, July 28, 1958 | Washington, D. C.

News Section

Printed in Two Sections

SUMMIT: *When Ike caved in*_____(page 1)

HR 3: *Will McClellan lead the way?*_____(page 2)

UN: *Why it aids the Reds*_____(page 2)

EDUCATION: *Another phoney crisis*_____(page 3)

INTEGRATION: *"Liberal" words vs. deeds*___(page 4)

The Great Anticlimax: Whatever may be the next turn of the dizzy world kaleidoscope—further befuddling members of Congress—one comparatively safe conclusion emerges from the Middle East imbroglio: Khrushchev prefers "diplomacy" to war.

"Liberal" Senators, warning solemnly of the danger of the Middle East situation developing into an all-out nuclear conflict, opposed the Administration's move into Lebanon. The Joint Chiefs of Staff—discounting any such extreme outcome—released the Marines.

Whereupon, many nervous observers fixed their eyes on Iran. There, they feared, Khrushchev by direct or indirect methods would move militarily. Instead, he called for a Summit conference. A strong propaganda device, true; but quite different from acceptance of the military challenge.

The Joint Chiefs, in their foresight, had ample basis for such action, in a precedent set last fall—and little publicized by the "liberal" element which urges appeasement at all costs. In October, 1957, Soviet Russia sought to bully Turkey in a series of hostile moves. Secretary of State Dulles, after conferring with the Joint Chiefs and obtaining their okay, warned that the United States —in contrast to Truman's Korean war policy—would attack Russia directly in support of our Turkish ally. He said that the territory of Russia would not be a "privileged sanctuary"—a phrase recalling the reverence with which the Truman Administration treated Red Chinese territory beyond the Yalu River. Forthwith, Russia ceased its hostile moves.

● Legislators under the Dome feel compelled to go back to our unhappy experiences in the Far East for precedents these days. They recall that the US leaders were hoodwinked into losing China to Moscow in 1947-49 by the myth that the Red Chinese were only "agrarian reformers." (Madame Chiang Kai-shek, in a speech to the National Press Club last week, declared that the principal factor in the sellout of her country was acceptance of this Red propaganda gimmick.)

Today, "Arab nationalism" has as much currency as the famous phrase "agrarian reformers." Barron's *weekly (owned by Dow-Jones, also proprietor of* The Wall Street Journal*) in a front page editorial, July 21, said: "What today masquerades as Arab nationalism is in fact neither nationalist nor Arab. It is, indeed, purely and simply a new Egyptian imperialism, aided and abetted by the Soviet Union." This idea is spreading rather widely in both houses of Congress.*

But many members are not at all happy about the new turn of events—Ike's acceptance of the idea of a Summit conference (now dubbed "the big anticlimax" by some newsmen), albeit under the United Nations. Any Summit conference, under whatever auspices, meets the same objections as are voiced this week in Article Section I of HUMAN EVENTS, by Past National Commander of the American Legion Donald R. Wilson. By this time, at all points of the political compass in the country, sentiment has been registered in general agreement with the belief that such a conference would be futile, if not extremely dangerous.

● What happened to bring about the somersault at the top level? The grapevine says: at ten a.m., July 22, Ike told Senators that he would under no circumstances go to a Summit meeting now, did not even want Dulles to attend. He heatedly declared: "Those _____ Russians want to make propaganda capital out of it; I won't lend the prestige of the United States to it." And he dictated a firm note rejecting the Khrushchev demand.

But, shortly before two p.m., the President was summoned to the telephone: Macmillan calling from London. What was said by Macmillan is not precisely known—but immediately after the call, the President drafted a new note saying he would accept a Summit meeting, provided it was under the UN. (Macmillan is reportedly anxious for a Summit meeting as a means of quieting political rumbles in Great Britain.)

Meanwhile, on the same day, General de Gaulle had received the text of the first note, drafted that morning, from the US Ambassador in Paris. The note rejected any Summit conference. De Gaulle drafted his own message of rejection to Khrushchev, which appeared at the same time as Ike's revised note accepting. Hence, the discord between what the French leader released and what Ike at last said publicly.

● If a Summit meeting takes place, will Ike emerge as the new Neville Chamberlain of the Western World, compromising our freedom in a colossal Munich? Such is the fear of many members of Congress, for congressional

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

• Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentiment greeting the Summit announcement was sharply divided.

But old observers in the Capital wonder if the steam will go out of Khrushchev's patent propaganda maneuver —particularly if protracted wrangling takes place as to when, where and how (involving a number of thorny considerations) the big anticlimactic show would be shaped.

The Fight for HR 3: The bill to curb the Supreme Court, passed by the House, now lies before the Senate, awaiting action. Members in both houses watch eagerly for the next move on this bill, looked upon as perhaps the most important measure to pass either house this session. Their eyes are riveted on Senator John McClellan (D.-Ark.), who placed similar bills in the Senate hopper both last session and this. Senator Eastland, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee (through which HR 3 must pass before going to the floor for voting) welcomes action. Senator Lyndon Johnson, Democratic majority leader, who has most to say about whether or not the bill reaches the floor for vote, remains enigmatic. So—general opinion runs—it's up to the Senator from Arkansas to push this measure with as much vigor as he did the probes of Hoffa and Beck.

McClellan is a traditional conservative generally admired in the Capital. And, in the past week, the entire city has felt deeply the personal tragedy that has touched his life, as news came that his only surviving son had died in a plane crash.

McClellan's policy actions have varied in the present session. Good on Hoffa and Beck. Weak on Walter Reuther. Strong the past week when he sought to get to the bottom of the dispatch of Federal troops to Little Rock. Now he faces an opportunity and challenge in dealing with HR 3, which, as a "states' rights" bill, should be acceptable to him.

The eyes of the Nation—particularly of the South—are on him. So remarks one of his fellow legislators.

● Meanwhile, the spotlight also focuses on the author of the states' rights bill, Howard Smith (D.-Va.), Chairman of the House Rules Committee. Smith sits in a powerful position. Senators whose bills have reached the lower Chamber must pass this watchdog of the House before they can get a "rule" for action on the floor. Consequently, it is believed that Chairman Smith may be in a bargaining position from which to force Senate action on the bill. If that does take place, the chances appear excellent for its passage this session. Public pressure on Senators to follow the course of the House—if sufficiently strong—could win the rubber.

'Mr. Economy' — that nickname is conferred on Representative H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa) for his fight against paying President Truman a pension of $25,000 a year and perquisites. The accolade, colleagues agree, has been amply deserved for a long time. Gross opposes increases in congressional salaries, refuses to go "free riding" on any of the numerous congressional junkets abroad, fights against "pork-barrel" measures and tirelessly tries to cut down the Budget and save the taxpayers' money. He is an outstanding defender of the "honest dollar"—a rarity in this present session, which is rapidly earning a reputation as the most scandalously spendthrift of any Congress within recent memory.

Gross, therefore, is no mere Truman-baiter, nor one who seeks to grab the limelight by a partisan attack on the former Democratic President. It is evident that Truman has ample means for supporting himself; the big "mags" and the newspapers pay him generous sums for his pronouncements. He has received special income tax rebates for his books. The $25,000 pension proposed would constitute, in the eyes of Gross and many others, simply a waste of the taxpayers' money. Then there are the perquisites in the package—office space, a maximum of $100,000 a year for office staff and expenses and the franking privilege.

Congressmen note that former President Hoover seems to get along well enough without such "gravy." They cannot see why Harry should tap the public till in order, among other things, to broadcast his characteristic reckless and mendacious political utterances and then set other public servants to wasting even more tax dollars in an effort to deny or correct his "Trumanisms." Congressman Gross has many willing listeners.

Muddled Democrats: Democratic leaders have sought to take advantage of the Mideast crisis, belaboring Secretary Dulles and the Eisenhower Administration for the landing in Lebanon. Yet one of their most important Senators takes a sharply different view. Senator James O. Eastland (D.-Miss.), Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and of the Internal Security Subcommittee, told a television audience, July 19:

"I favored intervention in the Mideast . . . if we are to become a second-class power it will be because the nations of Western Europe will have to make terms with Russia; and in the Middle East, Russia is aiming at Western Europe. The economy of Western Europe depends upon oil from the Middle East. In fact, their economy couldn't run, they couldn't retain their standard of living without that oil . . . Russia knows that."

Replying to a question as to whether the Iraq coup wasn't simply an internal revolution, not a conspiracy, Eastland replied: "No, I know better. It's inspired by agitators trained in the Soviet Union. The war is being carried on there—the internal war and revolution—by Russian arms and equipment."

Hammarskjold: Clearer than at any time since the Korean war is the fact that the United Nations, far from an instrument for combatting communism, is in effect a means of strangling, in empty parliamentary ritual, any real attempt to halt Soviet aggression.

Long recognized as a reason for the UN's usefulness to the Reds has been its organizational structure, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

permits the Soviet Union to stall any significant attempts to mount concerted anti-Communist action. But, in recent days, those who charge the UN with being weighted to the Communist side also place strong emphasis on the record of its Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold.

The Lebanon crisis, say Washingtonians, has been one of the most blatant revelations of Hammarskjold's predilections. It is now known that Hammarskjold, who journeyed to Lebanon to determine whether the pro-Nasser, pro-Moscow "rebels" in that country were actually being aided from Soviet-dominated Syria, made a "deal" with Nasser, and deliberately misrepresented what was happening in the small Mideast republic.

The Nasser-Hammarskjold deal was that if the UN boss would cover up for Nasser's pro-Soviet game, Nasser would promise to be more tractable about coming to some compromise solution to the strife which he was promoting. Hammarskjold obliged the Egyptian dictator with his whitewash report, saying that the Lebanese "rebels" were not receiving help from outside sources.

● Yet another episode suggesting that Hammarskjold should be asked to explain which side of the street he is working is the continuing case of Povl Bang-Jensen, a Danish UN official discharged from his post for refusing to divulge the names of witnesses who testified before the Special UN Committee on Hungary. (The witnesses were afraid that their names would reach the Communists, and that reprisals would follow.) His action touched off a long wrangle in the UN, which culminated in a formal accusation of "misconduct" levelled at Bang-Jensen and in the release, early this month, of a letter from Hammarskjold, dismissing the Danish official from his post. (For previous items on the Bang-Jensen case, see HUMAN EVENTS for December 28, 1957 and March 10, 1958.)

Bang-Jensen retorted with a 70-page document giving his side of the story. Some of the disclosures in this indictment—bristling with citations of names, dates and places—offer still more startling revelations about Hammarskjold's sympathies. The Bang-Jensen document is a lengthy memorandum written to Hammarskjold himself, reviewing the case of the secret witnesses and all that followed them. Bang-Jensen quotes a previous communication with Hammarskjold concerning the witnesses' desire to remain anonymous.

Many of them, he said, made anonymity the condition of their giving testimony, and "two of them for very definite reasons which they specified, made it a condition that you [Hammarskjold] in particular would not know their names; there were also other witnesses who gave reasons for their lack of confidence in you and certain other members of the Secretariat."

Bang-Jensen discloses that he had previously informed Hammarskjold that "two [former] members of the Hungarian Communist party both asked whether they could be certain that Mr. Hammarskjold would not learn their names."

Education Front: The myth of an "urgent need" for Federal scholarship aid to bright students aiming for college was exploded in recent testimony by John R. Stalnaker, President of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation. Appearing before a House education subcommittee, Stalnaker disclosed that "in the National Merit Scholarship Program last year we identified some 15,000 students. We have since then checked samples of these students to determine how many are not in college.

"Of the top 7500 students, drawn from each state in proportion to population (just as both bills propose), we find about 97 per cent in college. Of the next 7500, about 95 per cent are in college."

Stalnaker pointed out that a Federal scholarship program would hardly change the minds of that fraction of bright students not going to college. Many of them are girls, who either marry or enter other types of training. Of the boys, many join the armed services or go into business.

Stalnaker continued: " . . . we must not lose sight of the fact that neither of the bills proposes scholarship help to more than the top three per cent of high school students and most of these students are eagerly sought by colleges and existing scholarship agencies.

"A large Federal program of, say, 40,000 scholarships would probably have as its major effect discouraging existing private and state efforts and would not significantly help able students not already being helped."

● Statistics compiled by the US Chamber of Commerce show that, under HR 13247, the principal Federal-aid-to-education bill, 15 states and the District of Columbia would pay out more money than they would receive during the first year of the Federal program. Citizens of New York, for instance, would lose $8,622,445. Michigan would lose $1,076,602; Delaware, $572,200; California, $5,103,349.

The bill provides $137 million to finance programs of Federal scholarships, student loans and various grants to the states. "Compared to the $20 billion which the American people will spend this year for education," says Dr. John R. Miles, head of the Chamber's Education Department, ". . . the $137 million seems almost trivial and certainly not worth the risk of Federal interference and control in education."

Defense Appropriations: Currently before the Senate Appropriations Committee is a "sleeper" proposal which, if passed, would go far to abolish the constitutional power of Congress to regulate the disposition of funds among the armed services. In his Budget for this session, President Eisenhower asked for a "transfer authority" which would allow him to shift up to $2 billion in appropriated funds from one military function to another—crossing service lines, if he desires, in the process. Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy, say Capitol denizens, gave a seemingly plausible defense of this request for "flexibility in appropriations" before the House Armed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Services Committee, but neglected to touch on the central point:

With this "transfer authority" in its pocket, the Executive could in effect abolish whole functions of the military simply by drying up the funds authorized for them and transferring the money elsewhere. (Total direct appropriations for the Marine Corps, for example, came to only $831 million in fiscal 1958. Thus this service, under the Administration's proposal, could theoretically be "transferred" out of existence.)

Integration: Further illumination of the "liberal" double standard on racial integration was brought out recently in a dispute between two newspapers, the Manchester, N. H., *Union-Leader* and the Little Rock, Ark., *Gazette*. The *Gazette* and its Executive Editor, Harry S. Ashmore, received Pulitzer prizes this year for their bitter journalistic opposition to Arkansas Governor Orval Faubus, during the school integration controversy last fall. But, it was subsequently reported, the fete staged to celebrate these honors was racially segregated. Further, questions from the conservative *Union-Leader* to editor Ashmore revealed that the *Gazette* has no Negro editorial employees, runs segregated obituary notices and classified real estate advertisements.

Ashmore, commented the Union-Leader, reveals that "although he believes integration to be fine for [Little Rock's] Central High School, it is not so fine for the Gazette."

Between Covers: T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, shows how confiscatory income tax rates enable the big spending that causes inflation, in *Wasteful Spending, Your Income Tax and Inflation*. This pamphlet illustrates, by a series of easily understood tables, how the ravages of taxes and inflation have combined to slash the real income of all Americans, from those in the lowest income brackets to those in the highest, by more than 50 per cent. The pamphlet may be obtained from Economic Research Associates, 6 Iris Lane, Richmond 26, Virginia. Single copy, 25 cents; special rates for quantity orders.

Tax Relief: Conservative legislators complain that while a weak bill advertised as furnishing "tax relief" to small business draws the attention of the press and public, a really effective means of easing America's tax burden is left to languish in the House Ways and Means Committee. This is the Sadlak-Herlong bill (HR 6452), which would launch a realistic program of tax reduction, furnishing relief to taxpayers in all brackets. (This legislation was first discussed, shortly after it was introduced, in HUMAN EVENTS for April 13, 1957.)

HR 6452 would reduce taxes, in various brackets, over a five-year period, as follows: from 20 to 15 per cent; from 34 to 19 per cent; from 50 to 23 per cent; from 91 to 42 per cent. A fusillade of protests from voters, say the bill's supporters, may help to dislodge it from the Ways and Means Committee, where it has already marshalled strong bipartisan support.

Verdict Rendered: Alger Hiss has received his verdict "in the court of public opinion." His book of that name, an attempt to vindicate himself originally priced at $5, and still available in its first edition, is now selling for 59 cents at New York book stalls.

Labor Front: Published last week was a massive study of big labor's political influence, entitled "The Labor Bosses—America's Third Party." Compiled by the Republican Policy Committee of the Senate, this document declares that the objective of the union bosses seems "not merely to take over the Democratic party but to eliminate it—along with the Republican party—as a decisive force in American politics." The report contains a thorough digest of the discoveries of the Senate Labor Rackets Committee during its hearings on the United Auto Workers. Also included is a detailed examination of labor's massive political spending. The reports filed by the bosses, listed in an appendix to the volume, reflect an admitted total of $1,884,197 spent for political purposes in 1956 and 1957.

This study, over 200 pages in length, may be obtained from the Senate Republican Policy Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C. Copies are free; only a limited number are available.

LIBRARIANS PRAISE HUMAN EVENTS

REBECCA A. HUDSON, Bishop College, Marshall, Texas: "HUMAN EVENTS has been of great use in giving our patrons information and comments on current events."

BROTHER BRENDAN, St. Michael's College, Santa Fe, N.M.: "HUMAN EVENTS presents a view which is different from that of many magazines we receive. Because of this, it is of great value to our professors and students in modern American thought."

EDWARD T. JACOBSON, Maxwell Library, Winona State Teachers College, Winona, Minnesota: "HUMAN EVENTS has been very useful for our social science students and students of political science."

HELEN WAHOSKEI, Wisconsin State College, Oshkosh, Wis.: "We like HUMAN EVENTS because of the frank evaluation of issues. This type of material is excellent work material for debaters and speakers."

ELGIN S. MOYER, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Ill.: "HUMAN EVENTS is good to have in our library to help students keep abreast of national and international developments."

A. P. MARSHALL, Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Mo.: "Several of the instructors have used HUMAN EVENTS and now are referring their students to it. It is a thought-provoking newsletter which we are glad to receive."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

- **Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.**
- **By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.**
- **Bound Annual Volume for 1957, with complete index, $15. 1955 and 1956 volumes available at same price. None available for previous years.**
- **For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**
- **The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."**

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher* M. STANTON EVANS, *Managing Editor*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1958.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 30 HUMAN EVENTS July 28, 1958

Article Section I

Printed in Two Sections

AMERICA'S CALL TO HONOR

Compromise With Red Tyranny Invites Defeat

By DONALD R. WILSON

Past National Commander, The American Legion

THE WORLD IS caught in an atmosphere of expectancy. The hope for "peace" in the Middle Eastern tangle, says Comrade Khrushchev, lies in some kind of meeting of the world's leaders at "the Summit." This new appeal is a variation on the overtures that the Communist chief has been making since last winter. His demands have goaded the leadership of the Western world into a fervent search for some way to lay the groundwork for a discussion of issues on which there is reasonable prospect of agreement.

Responsible leaders have been so pre-occupied with the question of whether there can be a meeting at the Summit that seemingly nobody has bothered to ask whether there *should* be such a meeting. We have frequently been told—indeed warned—that to refuse to negotiate differences with our enemy is to resolve to fight. This is a resolution that our political leadership has steadfastly refused to make with reference to the Soviet Union. But what is there to talk to the Soviet Union about?

All of the many specific prospective talking points advanced either by Russia or the United States are presumably calculated (a) to reduce international tensions, or (b) to diminish the possibility of war. Thus are justified proposals to talk about cessation of nuclear testing and production, creation of nuclear free zones, disarmament, cessation of war propaganda, strengthening of the UN, the status of East European countries, devotion of outer space to peaceful purposes, reunification of Germany, elimination of Middle Eastern strife, *etc.*

It is true that if Russia and the United States could resolve all of these and many other issues to their mutual satisfaction and advantage, the world would indeed be closer to a state of peace. With or without a Summit meeting, however, it must be apparent to all that these issues are not going to be so resolved.

These issues are not the real causes of international tensions. They are merely the outward signs of tensions. The true causes must be searched for and found in differences that are so fundamental for both the free world and the slave world that it is questionable that there can be room for negotiation.

These fundamental causes are rooted in the theory and practice of Soviet communism. The theory is that the non-Communist world is destined for extinction. The practice is to hasten this extinction by all means including, but not limited to, fraud, deceit, treachery, subversion and conquest without regard to human life and dignity and without regard to legal standards or values.

Our leaders keep asking the Soviet leadership to demonstrate its good faith. Unless the Soviet Union is prepared to renounce the very creed out of which it was born and by which it lives, such requests by our leadership are about as realistic as a mouse requesting a cat to give evidence of its good faith and friendly intentions before entering the well-known game of cat-and-mouse.

It may reasonably be asked how a question of such fundamental hostility can be negotiated. And if the basic issue is not resolved, if the root causes of tension are not removed, then what ultimate good is accomplished by negotiating or even reaching agreement on removing mere surface manifestations of the malignancy?

No compromise or appeasement regarding subjects such as the Middle East, disarmament, the status of Germany or Eastern Europe can possibly lead to peace while the Communists adhere to a belief in and furtherance of world dominion for the Soviets.

WHAT REASON do we have for relying on the sanctity of any agreements with the Soviets, on any subject? It is invariably admitted that we have very little other than the fact that there is always the possibility, however remote, that the Kremlin may actually honor its agreements, either by reason of "turning over a new leaf" or because the risk involved in breaking solemn agreements on crucial issues may be too great. As a clincher, the alternative to agreement is stated to be annihilation on a scale hitherto unknown.

Let us consider the argument about the Soviets' turning over a new leaf. Let us concede that anything is at least "remotely possible." Can we seriously bargain on life-or-death issues with no greater assurance than the "remote possibility" that our enemy will honor agreements made and entered into? What are the chances that the Soviets will abandon a strategy that has been winning steadily over the last generation?

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What about possible Soviet unwillingness to run the risk of breaking such solemn and important agreements? The statements of our political leadership show clearly that this is a fanciful argument. When Russia announced the cessation of nuclear tests, not one of our leaders thought she was sincere. Not one of our leaders would seriously rely on the Soviet Union to keep her pledges on any disarmament agreement. That's why we have had the steady insistence on an inspection system. Can our leaders believe that the Soviets would honor an agreement on the Middle East, or on Germany or East Europe?

Finally, what about the alternative to agreement—world-wide nuclear annihilation? We refuse to concede that we would take the initiative in launching such a human disaster. That leaves only the possibility that the Soviets might do so, at a time of their own choosing and on an issue of their own making. If the time should ever come when the Soviets felt they would have to resort to such a blow, it could only be because they felt the maneuver was both necessary and safe—necessary, to preserve themselves either internally or internationally, and safe because of the actual or prospective failure of retaliatory power. No mere agreement on any current issue would deter them under such circumstances. Only a major shift in their whole philosophy of life and government could protect us against such an eventuality under such circumstances.

We may be sure that the cold war will not be won at the conference table. The true issue is non-negotiable. The true issue involves the foundations of two utterly different and irreconcilable ways of life and philosophies of government. For either side seriously to compromise any of these fundamentals would be the beginning of the piecemeal destruction of its essential being.

There was a time when there was inspiration in the slogan, "Give me liberty or give me death." The issue was clear. There was no room for compromise or coexistence with tyranny. There was an unbending resolve to win. There was confidence in the triumph of right. There was no fear of death great enough to cause either a turning away from reality or a loss of belief in victory.

I CANNOT BELIEVE that this way of life and government of ours are only flashing meteors in the universe of man's political and personal aspirations. I believe they are stars of hope. I cannot believe that we are doomed to be eclipsed by depravity and bondage and moral and physical cowardice.

We have been victorious over the threat of tyranny before. We can be again. History teaches that peoples grow strong by responding to challenge. They grow weak only when they compromise or when they appease the challenger and avoid a determined response to the challenge.

What, then, is needed today?

First, there must be a recognition of the fact that the challenge which the Soviet Union has issued to us and the philosophy which has motivated its issuance have engaged us inevitably in a life-or-death struggle. There is no middle ground to be found and no compromise which can afford both life and victory to these antagonists. All efforts along these lines are doomed to failure. We can call this a cold war if we wish, but we must acknowledge it as a war.

Secondly, we must recognize that the threat of armed conflict is always with us so long as we continue the struggle. At one end of the spectrum of our struggle lies surrender. By surrender we could eliminate the threat of nuclear war. At the other end of the spectrum lies armed conflict. As we intensify our response to Russia's challenge we theoretically increase the risk of Russia's armed retaliation. As we grow more successful in the war of our different ways of life, we increase the possibility of forcing Russia to take the last desperate gamble. We must resolve to take this risk.

We must analyze Russia's strengths and sap them. Russia is not invincible—politically, economically, militarily or ideologically. We must learn her vulnerable areas in each of these fields and exploit them to the fullest. This is precisely what Russia is trying to do to us. We keep temporizing and hoping that she will cease. While we hesitate and hope, we lose advantage after advantage. Until we plan as skillfully and effectively for the downfall of the Communists as they plan for our own, the tide of battle will continue to move against us.

Fear of open war will defeat us. Fear of failure will defeat us. Only courage, faith and inflexible responses to challenge will save us.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "AMERICA'S CALL TO HONOR" at $_____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 30 HUMAN EVENTS July 28, 1958

Article Section II *Printed in Two Sections*

THE UNION BOSSES SPEAK

Labor Chiefs' Own Words Reveal Their Aims

The following article, consisting of statements by some of America's most influential labor leaders, shows what the goals of these men are, and how they propose to obtain them.

"IF THE TEAMSTERS and the two dock unions got together they'd represent more economic power than the combined AFL-CIO. They are so concentrated. An economic squeeze and pressure can be exerted that puts any employer in a very tough spot—and furthermore, puts the US Government on a tough spot. If the AFL-CIO meets us head on, we'd knock the stuffings out of them. We'd fight on their own ground and win."—*Harry Bridges; Wall Street Journal, August 1, 1957.*

* * *

"Every other nationwide strike from now on will be not just a one-union strike but a strike of the entire American labor movement."—*James B. Carey, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers; IUD Digest, July, 1956.*

* * *

"If this boycott should force the company to go out of business the workers will be no worse off."—*L. S. Buckmaster, President of the United Rubber Workers; Winchester, Virginia, Evening Star, January 21, 1957.*

* * *

"The future of labor-management relations is big labor and big business, for there is no room for the small business or the small union. That is unfortunate, but true. We have reached the saturation point. Now we have to organize what don't belong to us to stay in business. We are in business to make money—not for profit, we are a non-profit organization, but to expand. We are out for every quarter we can get."—*James R. Hoffa, Teamster vice president; in an interview with The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 4, 1956.*

* * *

"James J. Sporny, manager of the Equipment Division of Quaker City Motor Parts Co., testified that on Tuesday Bernard J. Marcus, organizing director for Teamsters Joint Council 53, told him: 'You will get nothing in. We will close you up first if you don't sign up. We don't want a vote, we want a contract. I control Philadelphia. The union controls the country.' "—*Philadelphia Inquirer, December 20, 1956.*

* * *

"Mr. Hoffa announced, at a meeting of the union's constitution committee, that if he was elected he would fight for an all-embracing council of American transport unions—air, land and sea—for joint action. 'You cannot have a one-city strike any more,' he said, 'or a strike in just one kind of transportation. You have to strike them all.' "—*James R. Hoffa, vice president, International Brotherhood of Teamsters; New York Times, August 8, 1957.*

* * *

"We are very sorry to hear that you object to becoming a member of the largest labor organization in the City of Quincy, namely, Lodge No. 822, of the International Association of Machinists. We are giving you the opportunity to join our organization and become a part of the greatest union in America today. If your signed application is not received within the next few weeks, other action will be taken against you.

"We do not like to take such action, but when you force us to it, we will carry out the mandate. Our forefathers fought hard to accomplish what benefits the worker has today, and we intend to preserve that accomplishment, if we have to revert back to their tactics. We are very certain that you wouldn't want to be followed along the streets and called 'scab.' "—Letter from Edward Hoffman, Chairman, Organizing Committee, Lodge No. 822, International Association of Machinists, to employees of a machine company, Quincy, Ill., March, 1949.

"LABOR TROUBLE is ahead if the Ohio right-to-work law is passed. I know lots of tricks to use on the production lines. Then watch what happens to production figures."—*Richard Gosser, vice president, UAW, in a speech on October 30, 1957, before Toledo Industrial Development Committee.*

* * *

"It seems to me that it is almost sinful to have any labor dispute degenerate to the point this one has—where we actually have to wreck the company. That's what we're doing, wrecking the company."—*Don Rand, UAW international representative, in discussing union action in the Kohler dispute; The Wall Street Journal, August 9, 1956.*

* * *

"This is not going to be any milktoast movement. We are going to seek these things in a mili-

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tant manner. In the militant manner in which our organization was founded." — *Walter Reuther, New York Times, December 8, 1955.*

* * *

"We boys are moving South. It may mean murder and bloodshed. Can you imagine what those textile hillbillies will do with a gun in their hands once we get a few of them paying dues? We mean to do it. We are going to organize every textile company in the South."—*Article in The American Textile Reporter, February 16, 1956.*

* * *

"We are driving to see that every so-called labor leader speaks for what is best for the movement and not what is best for him. We are going to get the labor leaders who differ publicly with the position on candidates and issues already established by the labor movement. Such differings [hurt] the cause. These so-called labor leaders that differ with the movement will be uncovered. We plan to, and we will, publicly and among the rank-and-file, brand them as traitors. That's what they are—traitors—and that's what they will be called—traitors.

"We are warning you now, and we are warning all in the future: DO NOT DIFFER WITH THE MOVEMENT WITH RESPECT TO ISSUES OR CANDIDATES. WE WILL NOT STAND FOR IT."—James L. McDevitt, Co-director of COPE, at a regional meeting of local union officials in New England at Hartford, Conn., July 19, 1956; from an observer on the spot.

* * *

"At times we are derelict in political action. Therefore, I soon will propose to the international executive board that we subsidize union members to run for state legislatures."—*David J. McDonald, President of the United Steelworkers of America; New York Times, October 20, 1957.*

* * *

"We as American trade unionists have much to learn from the European experience as regards mobilizing our labor political strength for social gains at the political level, if we want to benefit by the experience of our European colleagues."—*Walter Reuther, in opening address to the delegates of an international Automotive Conference, held by the Automotive Department of the International Metalworkers Federation, May, 1956.*

* * *

"More and more, the answers to labor's problems are political. What is true of labor is equally true of America. In such a situation, labor's political action will become increasingly important. I do not want our movement to be the tail of any party's political kite. I want it to be able to influence the political behavior of our parties. Our job will take us into the community agencies, into local and state politics, into social planning, into the bloodstream of American life."—*James B. Carey, President of the International Union of Electrical Workers, speech at Rutgers University; Daily Labor Report No. 151, August 3, 1956.*

"I BELIEVE DEEPLY that the time has come in America when the labor movement must assert the principle of codetermination. Representatives of labor, which after all is the majority of our consumers, should sit on policy-making boards of the corporation, so that we may have a voice, even if no meaningful vote, in decisions affecting pricing policies, products to be made, locations of plants and the speed at which automation will be introduced so that hardship and needless suffering may be avoided."—*Ralph Helstein, President, United Packinghouse Workers of America, in an address delivered at the Fourth Biennial Conference of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, AFL-CIO, September 30, 1957.*

* * *

"Your chairman is not going to pay the least attention to any of these court injunctions. The courts are being used in this instance by people who want to destroy the courts, and it is high time that the officers and locals of this organization take steps to defy these irresponsible actions by irresponsible, confused and ignorant judges."—*James Carey, President, International Union of Electrical Workers, commenting on UEW requests for injunctions against IUEW; New York Times, November 30, 1949.*

* * *

"The critical industrial decisions which must be dealt with by democratic industrial planning would have to include production levels, investment levels, employment levels and the rate and nature of mechanization and technological change . . . the nature and quality of goods produced. They would include the labor-management relations and the foreign relations of our big corporations. They would include the policies of these corporations in respect to natural resources, and in respect to the size and location of industrial plants. The whole program, of course, would call for the adoption of extensive Federal legislation."—*John Brophy, Industrial Union Councils, explaining the "Reuther plan," 1952.*

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "THE UNION BOSSES SPEAK" at $ _____.

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately—at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED